



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

Am

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/043,719	01/09/2002	Piotr Jozef Drozdzewicz	7257/75(a)	6462

7590 06/23/2005

WONG CABELLO LLP
20333 S.H. 249
SUITE 600
HOUSTON, TX 77070

EXAMINER

JEAN GILLES, JUDE

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2143

DATE MAILED: 06/23/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/043,719	DROZDZEWICZ ET AL.
	Examiner Jude J. Jean-Gilles	Art Unit 2143

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on April 07th, 2005.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 09 January 2002 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This Action is in regards to the Reply received on 07 April, 2005.

Response to Amendment

1. This action is responsive to the application filed on April 07th, 2005. Claim 11 is amended. Claims 1-18 are pending. No new claims have been added. Claims 1-18 represent a conferencing method.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 9, 13, and 14 have been carefully considered, but are not deemed fully persuasive. Applicant's arguments are deemed moot in view of the following new ground of rejection as explained here below, necessitated by Applicant's interpretation of the references cited in the First Office Action to render the limitations of the claims obvious over the patents of Gifford et al. (U.S. Patent 6,549,612) in view of Slutsman et al. (U.S. Patent 6,604,129) to the claims which significantly affected the scope thereof.

The Office acknowledges appropriate correction made to claim 11 as requested in the First Office Action.

The dependent claims stand rejected as articulated in the First Office Action and all objections not addressed in Applicant's response are herein reiterated.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. **Claims 1-18** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gifford et al (Gifford), U.S. Patent No. 6,549,612 B2 in view of Slutsman et al. (Slutsman), U.S. Patent No. 6,604,129 B2, further in view of Abato et al. (Abato), U.S. Patent No. 6,513,069.

Regarding **claim 1**, Gifford teaches the invention substantially as claimed. Gifford discloses a method for providing a conference for a subscriber and a plurality of participants at a set time using a conferencing system in a telecommunication system, the telecommunication system incorporating an Internet (*fig. 4*), the method comprising:

assigning in a web server of the conferencing system a unique URL for the conference of the subscriber (*column 6, lines 25-43*),

providing the unique URL through the Internet to a web browser of the subscriber (*column 12, lines 12-28*),

delivering the unique URL and the set time through the Internet from the web browser of the subscriber to each of the plurality of participants, the

subscriber and the plurality of participants comprising end-users in the conference (*column 6, lines 24-37; column 14, lines 18-65*),

each of the end-users clicking on the delivered URL at the set time to access the web server of the conferencing system through the Internet (*column 12, lines 52-67; column 13, lines 1-19*);

However, Gifford fails to teach a the step of each of the end-users providing endpoint identification information corresponding to an endpoint to the accessed web page, connecting each endpoint of the end-users to the conference in the conferencing system through the telecommunications system in response to the provided endpoint identification information.

In the same field of endeavor, Slutsman discloses a (communications system conducted on the Internet where the host sends a conference request to the participants that contains the potential participant addresses, the attributes of the requested conference...and established a video link between the host and the participants) [see *Slutsman, column 5, lines 16-35; column 6, lines 10-46; fig. 3, items 100, 200, and 500*].

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the networking art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated Slutsman's teachings of a method and apparatus to request end-users to provide endpoint identification and connect the endpoints to the system, with the teachings of Gifford, for the purpose of "*facilitate the integration of services which allow end-users to be tracked and to provide a computer system that act in*

conjunction with voice messaging and digital communications " as stated by Gifford in lines 8-20 of column 3. Thus, Slutsman also provides motivation to combine by stating a need to also provide to the network with "*the ability to coordinate the scheduling of a conference over the Internet...*" [see Slutsman, column 2, lines 1-3].

While the combination Gifford-Slutsman teaches the method above, Gifford-Slutsman does not teach in details the step of "delivering the unique URL from the subscriber to each of the plurality of participants". In the same field of endeavor, Abato teaches ... "a server that receives the subscriber's URL though its URL decoder and delivers the code of the URL over the internet to the users PC..." [see Abato, column 6, lines 56-67].

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the networking art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated Abato's teachings delivering a URL from the subscriber to each of the plurality of participant, with the teachings of Gifford-Slutsman, for the purpose of creating "...a system wherein no specialized chip set need to be produced or implemented into the standard PC, to keep complexity to a minimal" as stated by Abato in column 3, lines 51-54. By this rationale, claim 1 is rejected.

Regarding **claim 2**, the combination Gifford-Slutsman-Abato teaches the method of claim 1 wherein providing the unique URL occurs by emailing the unique URL through the Internet to the subscriber [see Gifford, *column 15, lines 14-27*]. The same motivation that was utilized in the combination of claim 1,

applies equally as well to claim 2 [see Slutsman, *column 2, lines 1-3*; see Gifford, *column 3, lines 8-20*]. By this rationale **claim 2** is rejected.

Regarding **claim 3**, the combination Gifford-Slutsman-Abato teaches the method of claim 1 wherein providing the unique URL comprises:

placing the unique URL on a web page of the web server [see Gifford, *column 5, lines 1-18*],

copying of the placed URL by the subscriber from the web page of the web server [see Gifford, *column 7, lines 46-67*]. The same motivation that was utilized in the combination of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 3 [see Slutsman, *column 2, lines 1-3*; see Gifford, *column 3, lines 8-20*]. By this rationale **claim 3** is rejected.

Regarding **claim 4**, the combination Gifford-Slutsman-Abato teaches the method of claim 1 wherein delivering comprises emailing the unique URL through the Internet to the web browser of each of the plurality of participants [see Gifford, *column 15, lines 14-27*]. The same motivation that was utilized in the combination of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 4 [see Slutsman, *column 2, lines 1-3*; see Gifford, *column 3, lines 8-20*]. By this rationale **claim 4** is rejected.

Regarding **claim 5**, the combination Gifford-Slutsman-Abato teaches the method of claim 1 wherein delivering comprises:

placing the unique URL on a web page of the subscriber [see Gifford, *column 5, lines 1-18*],

copying of the placed URL by the participants from the web page of the subscriber [see *Gifford, column 7, lines 46-67*]. The same motivation that was utilized in the combination of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 5 [see *Slutsman, column 2, lines 1-3*; see *Gifford, column 3, lines 8-20*]. By this rationale **claim 5** is rejected.

Regarding **claim 6**, the combination Gifford-Slutsman-Abato teaches the method of claim 1 wherein the unique URL is a graphical icon [see *Gifford, column 11, lines 25-29*]. The same motivation that was utilized in the combination of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 6 [see *Slutsman, column 2, lines 1-3*; see *Gifford, column 3, lines 8-20*]. By this rationale **claim 6** is rejected.

Regarding **claim 7**, the combination Gifford-Slutsman-Abato teaches the method of claim 1 wherein the endpoint is a telephone and wherein the endpoint information is a telephone number for the telephone [see *Slutsman, column 2, lines 27-47*]. The same motivation that was utilized in the combination of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 7 [see *Slutsman, column 2, lines 1-3*; see *Gifford, column 3, lines 8-20*]. By this rationale **claim 7** is rejected.

Regarding **claim 8**, the combination Gifford-Slutsman-Abato teaches the method of claim 7 wherein connecting comprises: calling the telephone for the telephone number provided in the endpoint identification information, adding the telephone to the conference when it goes off-hook [see *Gifford, column 2, lines 27-67*]. The same motivation that was utilized in the combination of claim 1,

applies equally as well to claim 8 [see Slutsman, *column 2, lines 1-3*; see Gifford, *column 3, lines 8-20*]. By this rationale **claim 8** is rejected.

Regarding **claim 9**, the combination Gifford-Slutsman-Abato teaches a method for providing a conference for a subscriber and a plurality of participants using a conferencing system in a telecommunication system, the telecommunication system incorporating an Internet, the method comprising:

assigning in a database of a web server of the conferencing system a unique URL for the conference of the subscriber [see Gifford, *column 11, lines 66-67; column 12, lines 1-28*],

providing the unique URL through the Internet to a web browser of the subscriber [see Gifford, *column 12, lines 12-28*],

delivering the unique URL from the subscriber to each of the plurality of participants, the subscriber and the plurality of participants comprising end-users in the conference [see Gifford, *column 6, lines 24-37; column 14, lines 18-65*], [see Abato, *column 6, lines 56-67*],

activating the conference in the conferencing system when the delivered URLs are clicked on by the end-users [see Slutsman, *column 2, lines 27-67*]. The same motivation that was utilized in the combination of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 9 [see Slutsman, *column 2, lines 1-3*; see Gifford, *column 3, lines 8-20*]. By this rationale **claim 9** is rejected.

Regarding **claim 10**, the combination Gifford-Slutsman-Abato teaches the method of claim 9 wherein delivering comprises emailing the unique URL through

the Internet to the web browser of each of the plurality of participants [see *Gifford, column 15, lines 14-47*]. The same motivation that was utilized in the combination of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 10 [see *Slutsman, column 2, lines 1-3*; see *Gifford, column 3, lines 8-20*]. By this rationale **claim 10** is rejected.

Regarding **claim 11**, the combination Gifford-Slutsman-Abato teaches the method of claim 9 wherein delivery comprises: placing the unique URL on a web page. The web page could be anywhere, owned and operated by anyone [see *Gifford, column 9, lines 39-64*].

copying of the placed URL by the participants from the web page of the subscriber [see *Gifford, column 7, lines 46-67*]. The same motivation that was utilized in the combination of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 11 [see *Slutsman, column 2, lines 1-3*; see *Gifford, column 3, lines 8-20*]. By this rationale **claim 11** is rejected.

Regarding **claim 12**, the combination Gifford-Slutsman-Abato teaches the method of claim 9 further comprising:

each of the end-users clicking on the delivered URL at the set time to access the web server of the conferencing system through the Internet [see *Gifford, column 12, lines 52-67; column 13, lines 1-19*],

each of the end-users providing endpoint identification information corresponding to an endpoint to the accessed web page [see *Slutsman, column 3, lines 15-48*],

connecting each endpoint of the end-users to the conference in the conferencing system through the telecommunications system in response to the provided endpoint identification information [see *Slutsman, fig. 3, items 100, 200, and 500; column 6, lines 10-46*]. The same motivation that was utilized in the combination of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 12 [see *Slutsman, column 2, lines 1-3; see Gifford, column 3, lines 8-20*]. By this rationale **claim 12** is rejected.

Regarding **claim 13**, the combination Gifford-Slutsman-Abato teaches a method for providing a conference for a subscriber and a plurality of participants at a set time using a conferencing system in a telecommunication system, the telecommunication system implemented with an Internet [see *Gifford, fig. 4*], the method comprising:

assigning in a web server of the conferencing system a unique URL for the conference of the subscriber [see *Gifford, column 6, lines 25-43*],

providing the unique URL through the Internet to a web browser of the subscriber [see *Gifford, column 12, lines 12-28*],

delivering the unique URL and the set time through the Internet from the web browser of the subscriber to each of the plurality of participants, the subscriber and the plurality of participants comprising end-users in the conference [see *Gifford, column 6, lines 24-37; column 14, lines 18-65*] , [see *Abato, column 6, lines 56-67*],

an end-user clicking on the delivered URL at the set time to access the web server of the conferencing system through the Internet [see *Gifford, column 12, lines 52-67*],

the end-user providing a telephone number corresponding to a telephone to the accessed web page [see *Slutsman, column 3, lines 15-48*],

calling the telephone from the conferencing system through the telecommunications system in response to providing the telephone number [see *Slutsman, column 3, lines 15-67*],

connecting the end-user to the conference when the called telephone goes off-hook [see *Slutsman, column 3, lines 15-67*]. The same motivation that was utilized in the combination of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 13 [see *Slutsman, column 2, lines 1-3*; see *Gifford, column 3, lines 8-20*]. By this rationale **claim 13** is rejected.

Regarding **claim 14**, the combination Gifford-Slutsman-Abato teaches a method for providing conferences in a telecommunication system for a plurality of subscribers, the method comprising:

providing a plurality of URLs in a web server at a conferencing system in the telecommunication system [see *Gifford, column 6, lines 25-65*],

assigning in the web server at least one of the plurality of URLs to each of said plurality of subscribers [see *Gifford, column 6, lines 25-65*],

activating a conference in the conferencing system when the URL of a subscriber accesses the web server of the conferencing system over the Internet

from a web browser of the aforesaid subscriber or of a participant to the conference [see Slutsman, *column 27-67*] , [see Abato, *column 5, lines 40-67; column 6, lines 1-67; column 7, lines 1-46*]. The same motivation that was utilized in the combination of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 14 [see Slutsman, *column 2, lines 1-3; see Gifford, column 3, lines 8-20*]. By this rationale **claim 14** is rejected.

Regarding **claim 15**, the combination Gifford-Slutsman-Abato teaches the method of claim 14 wherein activating comprises: receiving endpoint information from the subscriber and from each participant accessing the URL of the subscriber, connecting each endpoint for each received endpoint information to the conference [see Slutsman, *column 27-67*]. The same motivation that was utilized in the combination of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 15 [see Slutsman, *column 2, lines 1-3; see Gifford, column 3, lines 8-20*]. By this rationale **claim 15** is rejected.

Regarding **claim 16**, the combination Gifford-Slutsman-Abato teaches the method of claim 15 wherein an endpoint is a telephone and the endpoint information is a telephone number for the telephone [see Slutsman, *column 27-47*]. The same motivation that was utilized in the combination of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 16 [see Slutsman, *column 2, lines 1-3; see Gifford, column 3, lines 8-20*]. By this rationale **claim 16** is rejected.

Regarding **claim 17**, the combination Gifford-Slutsman-Abato teaches the method of claim 16 wherein connecting comprises calling the telephone number.

The same motivation that was utilized in the combination of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 17 [see Slutsman, *column 2, lines 1-3*; see Gifford, *column 3, lines 8-20*]. By this rationale **claim 17** is rejected.

Regarding **claim 18**, the combination Gifford-Slutsman-Abato teaches the method of claim 14 wherein at least one URL has an associated icon [see Gifford, *column 11, lines 25-29*]. The same motivation that was utilized in the combination of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 18 [see Slutsman, *column 2, lines 1-3*; see Gifford, *column 3, lines 8-20*]. By this rationale **claim 18** is rejected.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's Request for Reconsideration filed on November 16th, 2004 has been carefully considered but is not deemed fully persuasive. However, because there exists the likelihood of future presentation of this argument, the Examiner thinks that it is prudent to address Applicants' main points of contention.

A. Applicant contends that both the Gifford patent and the Slutsman Patent fail to disclose or suggest the step of "delivering the unique URL from the subscriber to each of the plurality of participant" in **claims 1, 9, and 13**.

B. Applicant contends that both the Gifford patent and the Slutsman Patent fail to disclose or suggest the step of "activating a conference in the conferencing system when the URL of a subscriber accesses the web server of the conferencing system over the Internet from a web browser of the aforesaid subscriber or of a participant to the conference" in **claim 14**.

C. Examiner will appreciate that an obviousness rejection is only appropriate when the combined references together disclose all the limitations of the claims

See *MPEP Par. 2143.03*.

6. As to "Point A" it is the position of the Examiner that both Gifford and Slutsman teach the limitations of the claim 1, 9, and 13. However, in view of Applicant's remarks, stating that the patents do not clearly teach "delivering the unique URL from the subscriber to each of the plurality of participant", a third patent, Abato is used as a new ground of rejection in combination with Gifford and Slutsman to render the

Applicant's arguments moot as explained above [see *rejection of claim 1*; see *Abato, column 6, lines 56-67*].

7. As to "Point B", it is also the Examiner's position that the Abato patent is used a new ground of rejection and renders the Applicant's arguments moot as explained above [see *rejection of claim 14 above*].

8. As to "Point C", the applicant will agree with the Office, that all limitations of the claims have been addressed. There exists clear motivation to combine Abato with Gifford and Slutsman, and together, those references disclose all the limitations of the claims.

Conclusion

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from examiner should be directed to Jude Jean-Gilles whose telephone number is (571) 272-3914. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday and every other Friday from 8:00 AM to 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wiley, can be reached on (571) 272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 305-3719.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Jude Jean-Gilles

Patent Examiner

Art Unit 2143



BUNJOB JAROENCHONWANIT
PRIMARY EXAMINER

JJG



June 18, 2005